LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

JUL 31 1967
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In the Supreme Court

OF THE

United States

OCTOBER TERM 1967

No. 441

In the Matter of the Application
of
RAYMOND C. WALLACE

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

to the United States Court of Customs
and Patent Appeals

RAYMOND C. WALLACE
462 Provident Building
Portland, Oregon

FOREWORD

After thiry-five years of creative thinking, patenting and promoting which proved monetarily unsuccessful, but certainly contributed to the economy of many at great expense to me and my family, I found that I am in no position to engage an attorney to replace the one I had retained for approximately fifteen years (Barlow & Barlow of Providence, R. I.) who, incidentally, withdrew from this case by their own choice after my patent application was rejected and my continuance of application which was filed under advisement was rejected.

Therefore, I respectfully request that the following be construed and accepted as a proper document to bring the case of Patent Application No. 78,200 and United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals No. 7788 before the United States Supreme Court for your review and decision.

In the Supreme Court

OF THE

United States

OCTOBER TERM 1967

No. .....

In the Matter of the Application
of
RAYMOND C. WALLACE

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals

Petitioner prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals entered in the above-entitled case of May 4, 1967.

Following is a copy of petition sent to the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals:

642 Prospect Street
Pawtucket, R. I.
July 4, 1967

Mr. George E. Hutchinson
U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: P. A. No. 7788

I respectfully request that a formal transcript of the record be prepared for transmission to the U. S. Supreme Court, and I also respectfully request that this letter be considered as a petition that the case and all written material that has been before the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals be a part of the transcript,—that includes:

Transcript of Record which was incomplete because the Certifying Officer of the Patent Office deleted authoritative documents that were referred to by the Patent Office but were omitted from my transcript,

Reply Brief

Prepared Statement of Oral Argument

My exhibits A, B and C which have been returned to the U. S. Patent Office.

I think it is only fitting and proper that all of this material which was before the Patent Appeal Board and then before the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals can be a part of the record in the U. S. Supreme Court, so that I can get a decision from this Court. I will try to follow the formal regulations when they have been clarified so I can understand them, and request the August 2 deadline be extended if necessary to allow me enough time to follow formal legal procedures.

Chief Deputy, Mr. Cullinan, asked me who I was suing—I am not suing anyone, I am merely asking for justice in a very unjust situation.

As I explained on the phone to you, Mr. Hutchinson, the Patent Office cited patents a second time costing me thou-

sands of dollars and loss of time and attorney's fees to argue patents for the second time which is a very unjust situation.

The reason I am asking for this to be inserted in the formal transcript is that my former attorney, Mr. Barlow, when he withdrew from this case and was brought to task by a Patent Office solicitor who told him he could not withdraw without my permission which was thereby given, advised me by letter to ask for an oral hearing before the Patent Appeal Board. A consultation with another patent attorney (at a slight charge) resulted in advice to ask for an oral hearing before the Patent Appeal Board. However, a search made by me in the public law library in the Providence Court House showed me that nothing would be accepted in a higher court, more specifically, the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals unless it was in writing before the Patent Appeal Board. But, neither of these attorneys advised me to file a written brief, without which nothing could have been brought before the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Again I repeat, I put everything in there to the best of my ability, to go to the Patent Appeal Board, and when I was going to bring this to the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals they were unfair to delete authoritative documents.

I think it only fitting and proper that although I am not an attorney, that justice can certainly be dealt and that the laws of the United States of America are not made for only those who have money to fight for justice. If justice cannot be dealt and the U. S. Supreme Court cannot give me a decision on what the Patent Appeal Board and the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals had before them in bound printed form, my faith in my Country and its Courts will be completely shattered.

I shall await further word from you.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND C. WALLACE

Telephone (401) PA 6-5912

I was told by Mr. Hutchinson, Clerk of U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals that this material is being compiled for transmission to the U. S. Supreme Court.

I respectfully request your consideration and indulgence and pray that you will grant my patent.

Respectfully submitted

RAYMOND C. WALLACE

Raymond C Wallace

Dated, Pawtucket, R. I.

July 15, 1967